

Q. To your knowledge did anything follow from this criticism of Gus Hall? Were any members expelled?

A. There were not any expelled, not to my knowledge.

Q. After Miss Flynn spoke you stated there was
8669 a meeting of the county committee, following shortly after Elizabeth Curley Flynn spoke? A. The Lucas County Committee meeting and executive committee meeting.

Q. What was the purpose of this meeting? A. The purpose of this meeting was to inform or instruct the county committee on the report which was given by Miss Flynn. Miss Sokol was the main speaker at this meeting.

Q. What did the committee say and decide? What happened? A. It wasn't a question of the committee deciding what it was going to do because those were orders that were handed down by the National Committee. The only thing they did at this meeting was to devise methods to comply with the orders of the National Committee.

Q. Where was this meeting held? A. At 147
8670 Maumee Avenue, at the home of Max Wall.

Q. What methods were devised by the county committee? A. There was one method—several of the ones we participated in and made suggestions. I gave one suggestion, and that was that the first name of Party members be written on one sheet of paper and the second name on another paper, paper with lines, and one list kept in one place and one in another, and when we wanted to find out just who was who, all we had to do was get the two sheets of paper and put them together and then you would have them. That method was devised locally there for a while, up until 1949. I don't know whether it was used after 1949.

Q. Was anything done with the records of the Party in Lucas County after this meeting? A. Most of the records were destroyed.

Q. You say you made a suggestion just how to keep future records of members. Was that suggestion adopted?

A. It was adopted.

Q. You further stated that the previous records were destroyed. Did you play any part in that destruction? A. I did.

8671 Q. What part did you play in the destruction of these records? A. I had access to a car, so I picked up the records at the office and at the home of Mr. Max Wall, a couple of large paper cartons and burned most of them after a period of time.

Q. The records you are speaking of that you obtained at the home of Max Wall—just what type of records were those? A. They were pamphlets, generally referred to as throwaways, bound books, et cetera.

Q. Were the Party membership lists destroyed at the same time? A. Part—I will say the old method of keeping Party membership lists was destroyed at that time.

Q. During all this time did the Party have an office in Toledo? A. They did, 501-1/2 Monroe Street.

Q. Mr. Cummings, were communist Party membership books issued for all the years that you were a member of the Party? A. They were not.

8672 Q. Can you tell us when they stopped issuing Party membership books? A. They were issued up until 1949.

Q. Were instructions given to discontinue membership books? A. They were.

Q. That was when? A. 1948.

Q. What happened to the old Party membership books? A. You are referring to the period of time before—

Q. When they had them. A. You were required to return the old Communist Party membership card or book to the Communist organization and you received a new one.

Q. Did you turn in your Party membership book each year turn back the old one? A. Well, there was one year I believe I didn't have one to return.

Q. Were you ever told to destroy your membership book?

The Witness: I was. I was told to.

By Mr. Nelson:

Q. Who told you that? A. I was told locally
8673 by Joe Sokol to destroy my Communist Party membership book, but I also attended a state committee meeting in Cleveland where it was discussed and I was also instructed at the state committee meeting to go out and instruct the Communist party members in Lucas County to destroy their membership books, which I did.

Q. Mr. Cummings, during your membership in the Party did you ever know any other Party member by more than one name? A. I did.

8674 Q. Earlier, I believe you mentioned a Party member by the name of Edwin Love. Did you ever know him by any other name? A. By the name of Edwin Lee, I did.

Q. Do you know which was his actual name? A. Edwin Love was his true name.

Q. How did you happen to know him also as—under what circumstances—did you know him as Edwin Lee? A. His membership in the Communist organization, and he subscribed to the Sunday Worker of the Communist Party under the name of Edwin Lee.

Q. Did you know other Party members by more than one name? A. I did. I knew Jack Carson by the name of Tony Ryan.

Q. Was it a common practice in the Party for certain Party members to use more than one name?

The Witness: It was a common practice.

By Mr. Nelson:

Q. Did you ever use any other name yourself? A. Not in connection with the Communist Party, I didn't.

Q. What was the purpose of these persons using more than one name?

8675 A. To conceal their identity with the Communist Party.

Q. You mentioned Edwin Love went under the name of Edwin Lee. Can you name others that used other false names or Party names? A. Yes, Eugene Stoll used the name of Johnston. I believe it was Eugene Johnston. He used the name Eugene Johnston, I believe that was in the thirties. I am speaking locally.

Q. Locally, Toledo. A. I was speaking locally of the local organization, but on a state scale I knew a gentleman in Akron, Ohio, who was known as Tommy L. I don't know what his full name was. He was only referred to as Tommy L.

Q. Do you know a person named Regina Sokol? A. I do.

Q. Was she a member of the Communist Party in Toledo? A. She was a member, the wife of Joe Sokol.

Q. Did she use any other name besides Regina Sokol? A. She did in her employment at the Willys-Overland Motors company. She used the name of Regina Rosen.

Q. Did you know a member of the Communist Party in Toledo named George Carson? A. I do.

Q. Did you ever know him to use any other name? A. Tony Ryan.

Q. Are there any others you can think of offhand, Mr. Cummings? A. Not locally.

Q. Mr. Cummings, you previously testified you were the chairman or captain of the shop club at Electric Autolite. A. That is right.

Q. As captain or chairman of this group what were your responsibilities? A. My responsibilities were to keep in contact, daily contact, with each member of Electric Autolite Shop Club.

Q. Did those responsibilities include collecting dues? A. Collecting dues, asking for financial contributions to the organization, et cetera.

Q. What method would you use for collecting dues? That is, recording payments of dues. A. They devised a method locally for collecting dues that went by numbers. I believe it was eight members of the Electric Autolite, and they started at one and came down to 8. They started putting the 1948 Party card numbers.

8677 Q. Mr. Cummings, I show you what has been marked Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 353 and ask you if you recognize this. A. I do. I recognize this document.

Q. I call your attention to the initials "W.G.C." thereon. Did you write that on there? A. I did.

Q. Is any of the other handwriting on there your handwriting? A. At the bottom, "Call Joe Sokol." That is mine.

Q. "Autolite CP shop cell." That isn't? It is 8678 "Call Joe Sokol"? A. It is "Autolite, CP shop cell." That is as far as I went, mine is "Call Joe Sokol."

Q. The only writing is your initials and "Call Joe Sokol"? A. That is right.

Q. How did this paper happen to come into your possession? A. Mr. Sokol gave me this to use in the shop in regards to collecting dues and financial contributions.

Q. He gave this to you to use to collect the dues? A. That is right, at the Electric Autolite.

Q. At the top there is a column of numbers running down one through 8. At the top opposite number 1 appears the number 63042. What does that number mean to you, if anything? A. That was my card number for 1948, my party card number for 1948.

Q. Opposite No. 4 appears the number 63112. Does that mean anything to you? A. That was Mr. Walter Harrison's card Party number for 1948.

Q. You didn't write these Party card numbers? A. I did not. Sokol wrote those.

Q. This is what you used to collect dues? A. That is right.

8679 Q. Just how would you use this paper or what was the significance of the column of numbers 1 to 8?

The Witness: By those numbers I was to know, myself and Mr. Sokol, were to know each person by this 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, even if we weren't able to get each one of the 1948 Party numbers on there. I was No. 1, and I know Walter Harrison was No. 4, and there were others.

By Mr. Nelson:

Q. Why didn't you use the names?

8680 The Witness: For security reasons. It was another one of the security measures that were used.

By Mr. Nelson:

Q. How did it happen that you used this number system? Did you receive instructions to do it this way?

The Witness: We received instructions locally to use them that way.

Q. Who gave you those instructions? A: Joe Sokol.

Q. Anybody else? A. The state leadership—they instructed—instruction was given at the state committee meeting for each locality to devise methods to keep a record of the Party dues and collections. That was devised as far as the shop club was concerned in the City of Toledo.

Q. When you say the State Committee do you recall the particular member of the Committee that gave those instructions? A. I recall that Gus Hall was Chairman and he gave those instructions, because they were instructions from the National Committee that it was so important that each state committee meeting throughout the United States as far as the Communist Party was concerned, 8681 that the chairman of each state should emphasize

security, security, security. That was handed down from the National Executive Board of the Communist Party.

Q. Mr. Cummings, you testified that you attended the second convention of the Communist Party of the State of Ohio in August of 1945 that reconstituted the Party. Did you see any persons there that you knew by more than one name? A. I did.

Q. Can you tell us what you recall on that subject? A. It was Joe Kress. Let me think for a moment. Kermit M. Kirkendoll was known as K. Ball.

Q. How do you know this? A. Because his name was listed in the nominations—he was nominated for the State Committee, and his name was on the nominating list. I knew him as Kermit M. Kirkendoll, and on this list he was listed as K. Ball.

8682 Q. I show you, Mr. Cummings, what has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 354 and ask if you have ever seen this document before. A. I have.

Q. I call your attention, down here in the corner, to the date. Is this your writing down here? A. Yes, that is my writing.

Q. August 13, 1945, with a circle around it? A. That is right.

Q. What is this list as you know it? A. This is the recommendations of the Nominating Committee, a list of names, recommendations of the Nominating Committee.

Q. At the state convention in August 1945? A. That is right.

Q. Look down this list under the heading of Cleveland, going on down here is a person by the name of Al Jones, with an "X" beside it. Did you make that X mark

8683 there? A. I did.

Q. What is the significance? Why did you put it there?

A. I wasn't sure whether that was his correct name or not.

Q. Did you know this Al Jones by any other name? A. No, I didn't know him by any other name.

Q. Going down here further is a person by the name of Joe Kelly with an "X" mark beside his name, and out at the side the name of Joe Kress. Did you make that notation? A. The writing in ink is my writing, and that is the correct name, Joe Kress. He is listed as Joe Kelly.

Q. Going down further in the name column I call your attention to a person by the name of B. Mack. Will you explain the markings there? A. This gentleman is an AF of L leader and his name was McGorty.

Q. Two names below that I call your attention to the name of Marie Rice, with an "X" mark. How about that? A. Her name is Marie Reed Hague.

Q. Going over to the second column and coming down under the designation of Cincinnati, there is only one name there. Will you give us that name and explain the "X" mark and so forth? A. The "X" marking—the name is Max Smith listed here, and you notice after the 8684 "X" mark is a question mark. I didn't know at that time the correct name, and I didn't find out later what it was.

Q. Turning over to the second page where there is only one column, the first name under the designation Dayton, what about that name? A. He is listed here as K. Ball, CIO union leader. His correct name is Kermit M. Kirkendoll.

Q. Did you personally know Mr. Kirkendoll? A. I personally knew him.

Q. Was he a member of the Party? A. He was a member of the Communist Party and a member of the Communist Political Association. He was a member of both.

8687 Q. Mr. Cummings, were you a member of the Nominating Committee at this state convention? A. I was. I was a member of the Nominating Committee.

Q. Was there anything said about the persons listed on this nominating list? A. There was. Mr. Arnold Johnson instructed the nominating committee not to use the correct names of certain members who might be nominated for the state committee.

Q. Mr. Cummings, during the time that you were a member of the Party and a member of the County Committee and the State Committee, did you have any knowledge as to the methods of communication used between the various administrative offices of the Communist Party? A. I did. There was a courier system after 1948, in 1947 and '48, during the security period.

8688 Q. How do you know they used a courier system?

The Witness: On two occasions I was present when couriers brought messages in to the city of Toledo. On one occasion Mr. Joe Brandt brought messages in and delivered them to Joe Sokol at a hall on Genessee Street in the city of Toledo, at a Communist Party meeting.

Q. Who was Joe Brandt? A. Joe Brandt was trade union director of the Communist Party of the State of Ohio.

Q. You say he brought documents to Joe Sokol. Where did he bring them from? Where did Brandt live? A. From the state office in Cleveland, Ohio.

Q. Were you present when he delivered these documents? A. I was present when he delivered the documents.

Q. You saw him deliver them? A. I saw him deliver them.

Q. Do you know what was in the documents, what it was about? A. One of the documents was on trade union concentration for the City of Toledo, Lucas County, 8689 and the other documents were instructions on the intended schools for the City of Toledo.

Q. What kind of schools? A. Communist Party schools.

Q. You mentioned you had two occasions to see such delivery of documents by courier. Will you recite or relate the circumstances of the other occasion? A. The second occasion was in March of 1949. Mr. Bob Campbell, who was Chairman of the Negro Commission of the State of Ohio, who was also on the State Committee of the State of Ohio, and the State Executive Board, came in Toledo and delivered documents to Joe Sokol.

Q. Were you present when these documents were delivered? A. I was present. I was chairman of this particular meeting.

Q. Did you see the documents delivered? A. I saw them delivered.

Q. Do you know what the documents were about? A. I think those documents—I am not sure, but they were on trade unions also.

Q. Mr. Cummings, during the time you were a member of the Communist Party in Toledo did the Communist Party receive mail at any place other than their official headquarters? A. They did. There were places 8690 where they received mail.

Q. How do you know? A. I went to those places to pick up Communist Party mail personally, and then I would drive the Chairman by to pick up mail.

Q. Were the places other than the Party headquarters where they would receive mail generally known?

The Witness: These were secret places where we received mail.

Q. How did you happen to know? A. Because, as I said, I picked up mail at those places. One was at a home of Mary Vallient and the home of Max Wall, 147 Maumee Avenue, and at the home of one Doctor John Pile on 12th Street, in the City of Toledo.

Q. Was Mary Vallient a member of the Communist Party? A. She was a member of the Communist Party.

Q. Was Dr. John S. Pyle a member of the Communist Party? A. He was. He was a member of the Communist Party.

Q. Did you pick up mail at all three of these addresses?

A. I did. I picked up mail at Dr. Pyle's on several occasions, and at the other places also.

Q. Did you deliver this mail to the official headquarters in Toledo? A. I delivered the mail to Joe Sokol, not to the headquarters. I delivered the mail to Joe Sokol.

Q. Who was chairman—A. Who was chairman of the Communist Party of Lucas County.

8697 Philip E. Mosely recalled as a witness for Petitioner, having been previously duly sworn was examined and testified further as follows:

8706 Cross examination

9031 Mr. Lenvin:

9032 As I am saying, we have not made any attempt to show how the Communist Party reaches the views which it did. All we are attempting to show is that it reached the view.

9035 By Mr. Abt:

Q. Now Professor, in your opinion could an informed American observer during the entire period we have been discussing, that is from 1945 roughly to 1950, have formed the following opinions with reference to developments in China on the basis of his own independent judgment and in the honest and sincere belief that those opinions were in the interest of his own country?

Mr. Paisley: Objection.

Mr. Abt: I am making that preliminary statement, and then I am going to ask a series of questions as to the opinion.

By Mr. Abt:

Q: First, that the Kuomintang regime was decadent, feudalistic, reactionary and corrupt.

Mr. Levin: Objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

9054 Q. In your opinion, Professor, could a conscientious scholar, on the basis of an examination of Exhibit 276, which is the Foster article, form any opinions as to whether or not the views in that article with reference to the seating of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations were reached by Mr. Foster independently of what you testified to be the Soviet view on this question as typified by Exhibit No. 275?

Q. Do you recall the question, Professor? A. Yes; I do, thank you.

In my opinion the basic policy recommendations and line of reasoning between the two items are directly parallel, and I have not previously testified on whether I had an opinion as to whether one was inspired by the other or directed by the other.

9055 Mr. Abt: I think you had better read the question again, Mr. Reporter.

(The pending question was repeated by the Reporter)

The Witness: In order to answer that question more directly than I did in my first answer I would like to say that the evidence in the Foster article and the evidence in the statement by the Soviet representative at the Security Council is in my opinion as a conscientious scholar

evidence of their views, of their line of reasoning, but not of the thought processes or political processes by which one or the other arrived at the position which he stated.

9057 Q. As I understood your answer to the previous question, Professor, you answered not only with reference to the particular exhibits and the particular view that we are now discussing, that is, Exhibits 275 and 276 and the issue of the seating of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, but you answered with reference to all the exhibits which have been offered in evidence. In other words, as I now understand it, you testified that the question of whether or not the views stated in any of the exhibits stemming from a Communist Party source were arrived at by the author of that view independently of what you testified to be the Soviet view as typified by an exhibit from a Soviet source is not a matter within your competence and that in no case you have an opinion on that question. Am I correct? A. I have concluded from my study of these and many other materials that the policy recommendations made by the official spokesmen of the Communist Party in the United States and in general the line of reasoning through which they support those recommendations are closely parallel to the policies advanced and promoted by the Soviet Government and supported by a closely parallel line of reasoning and analysis on the part of the Soviet presentations. I have not expressed any expert opinion as to the process by which the Communist Party of the United States arrives either independently or dependently, with dependence on the particular statement or instruction or indication from another source, at its position. I do not consider that I have expert knowledge of that aspect of Communist Party policy decisions.

9100 Q. Is it not a fact, Professor, that many contemporary commentators and many historians and other writers, subsequently commenting on this episode, all of whom are non-communists, expressed views similar to those expressed by Hoover and Gibson and 9191 similar to those expressed in Exhibit 166 with reference to the role of the League of Nations in the case of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria?

Mr. Lenvin: The same objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

9180 Q. In your opinion, Professor, could not an informed American observer have come to the conclusion in 1934 that the entry of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations would make a material contribution to the cause of preserving world peace and come to that conclusion on the basis of his own independent judgment and in the honest belief that that view was in the interest of his own country?

Mr. Lenvin: I object, Mr. Chairman. It is wholly irrelevant.

Mr. Brown: The objection is sustained.

9310 Q. In other words, if I understand you, you are now saying that what occurred was that a proposal was made to the affiliates of the Communist organization. You say that, having refreshed your recollection—Just a moment. You say that, having refreshed your recollection from Exhibit CP 30 for identification. And that no further public action or public statement of action was made, but that you observed that the building formerly occupied by the Communist International was no longer occupied by them when you were in Moscow, in 1943. Is that your statement? A. That is correct, in this sense: That I recall statements by individual national Communist parties or their leaderships stating that they concurred

in the decision. I do not know of any day at which representatives of those Communist Parties met and said that on this day the dissolution is legally carried out.

Q: Have you checked that question? Did you check it before you testified about the dissolution of the Communist International? A. No, because the statement of the proposal to dissolve the Communist International was regarded as a decision to dissolve it.

Q. So regarded by you, was it not? A. Yes. Among other people—

Q. You don't know whether it was so regarded by the Communist International? A. Well, if it didn't regard it as so, I don't know of any outward expression of such views in contrast to the proposal made by the presidium in its executive committee.

Q. Wasn't the submission for ratification an outward expression of that? A. Well, I have already referred to the fact that whether the Communist Parties operated legally, the formal step was taken of approving or concurring in the proposal made by the Presidium of the executive committee of the International.

9411 Q. Professor, would it not be possible for a reasonable and unbiased person, who examined the transcript of the evidence of the trials and studied all the surrounding facts and circumstances, independently and in the exercise of his own best and reasonable judgment, to reach the conclusion that the confessions were true and the defendants guilty as charged?

Mr. Paisley: I object.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Abt:

Q. As a matter of fact, Professor, did not very many observers and commentators who studied the trials, or who were observers at the trials, reach this conclusion completely independently of, and without regard to, and without being influenced by, the so-called Soviet view?

Mr. Paisley: I object.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Abt:

Q. Isn't it a fact, Professor, that such men as former Ambassador Davies, whom you testified this morning attended the trial daily, such men as the former President of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Benes, such men as Lord Beaverbrook, among many others, reached and stated their conclusion that the confessions of the defendants were true and that they were guilty as charged?

Mr. Paisley: I object.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Abt:

Q. Professor, have you read Ambassador Davies' book, "Mission to Moscow"? A. I have.

Q. And have you read his article on the treason trials which appeared in the American Magazine for December, 1941? A. By whom?

Q. By Mr. Davies. A. I believe I did read it at the time.

Q. Does not Mr. Davies state both in his book, Mission to Moscow, and in the American Magazine article, the title of which is "How Russia Blasted Hitler's Spy" that on the basis of his daily attendance at the trial, his observations and all other knowledge with reference to them that he gathered while in the Soviet Union, that the defendants were substantially guilty as charged in the indictments?

Mr. Paisley: I object.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

9577 Q. Now at the time of the Seventh World Congress, the Communist party was an affiliate of the Communist Internationale, was it not? A. Yes.

Q. And as an affiliated organization, is it not a fact that it sent a number of delegates to the Seventh Congress? A. Yes, that is my understanding.

9578

9581 Q. Professor, you testified that the Communist party characterized the war between Germany and Britain and France which began in September, 1939, as an imperialist war and unjust war, did you not? A. Yes, that was the general purport of my comments on that.

Q. In coming to this conclusion as to the character of the war, is it not a fact that the Communist party applied the Marxist or, if you prefer, the Marxist-Leninist concepts as to the causes and nature of wars, and as to the distinction between just and unjust wars which we reviewed in this cross-examination yesterday?

Mr. Lenvin. Before he answers that question, I would like to have the question read. I do not think I could understand it. I may be dense.

Mr. Brown. Mr. Reporter, please read the question.

(The pending question was read by the reporter 9582 as above recorded.)

Mr. Lenvin. I object to the question on the ground that it is irrelevant. It does not make any difference as to how they arrived at the view as to the war or that we had established what the view was.

Mr. Marcantonio. In other words, it does not make any difference how the Communist party reached any conclusion. Its thinking, its motivations, its literature in connection with, historical literature upon which it predicated its conclusions, in a given subject, has no bearing any more. Is that the contention?

Of course, I understand that is the contention of the petitioner. But I am addressing myself to the Panel in connection with this objection.

Mr. Brown. Well, the issue here is as to whether or not the same stand was taken on a given issue by both the Soviet Union—

Mr. Marcantonio. And how or why we took it does not make any difference, is that the decision of the Panel? I

would like to have it at least for the Panel so we know what the decision is. How it came about, the reasoning that brought it about, the background, the historical references, and the literature upon which the decisions were predicated, all that is considered irrelevant.

9583 Mr. Paisley. The Act says—let's read it.

Mr. Marcantonio. We know what the Act says.

Mr. Paisley. The extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from those of foreign governments or foreign organizations. It doesn't say anything about whether the policy was good, bad or indifferent, or why each side arrived at their conclusions.

Mr. Lenvin. How they arrived at their conclusions—

Mr. Marcantonio. I know what the Government's contention is. That is all right with me. Frankly, I am very happy that they have taken their position because it reveals the complete absurdity of their position. But I want to know what the ruling of the Panel is.

Mr. Brown. It occurs to the Chair that the reply to respondent's question would be in the affirmative.

Mr. Marcantonio. In the affirmative, that it is irrelevant? In other words, how the respondent came about reaching certain decisions and taking certain public positions on various issues is irrelevant?

Mr. Brown. Yes, sir.

Mr. Marcantonio. Then we will ask our questions for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Abt. I do not think, formally on the record, that the Panel has ruled on the question.

Mr. Marcantonio. Yes, Mr. Lenvin objected—didn't you?

9584 Mr. Lenvin. Yes, I did.

Mr. Brown. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Brown. The objection is sustained.

By Mr. Abt:

Q. Is it not a fact, Professor, that any person who applied these Marxist concepts as to the cause and nature of wars, and as to the distinction between just and unjust wars, to the facts of this particular war would at that time independently have come to the same conclusion to which the Communist party came?

Mr. Lenvin: The same objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

9841 Q. Could not an unbiased, objective and informed American observer as of that time have come to the conclusion, on the basis of his own independent judgment of what was in the best interests of his country and its people, that the United States should not intervene in the Soviet-Finnish negotiations and should have supported Soviet position in those negotiations?

Mr. Lenvin: The same objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

9883 Q. Would it not be accurate to state, Professor, that there was a very large and broad measure of agreement among the people and many of the leaders of both the Soviet Union and the United States on the need for the prompt establishment of a second front in Europe?

Mr. Lenvin: Objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

9890 Q. Is it not a fact, Professor, that in June 1942, shortly after the appearance of the Dennis article, the United States, British and Soviet governments issued a communique announcing that complete agreement had been reached, and I quote, "With regard to the urgent task of the creation of a second front in Europe in 1942"?

Mr. Lenvin: Objection.

9891 Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Abt:

Q. Was not that communique made after the visit of Mr. Molotov first to London, where he conferred with Mr. Churchill, and then to Washington, where he conferred with President Roosevelt?

Mr. Lenvin: The same objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Abt:

Q. To be precise as to date, was not that communique issued on June 11, 1942?

Mr. Lenvin: The same objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Abt:

Q. Would it not be accurate, therefore, to state that the Communist Party position on the second front paralleled the policy of the three allies, that is to say, the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, as officially announced in this communique?

Mr. Lenvin: The same objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

9940 Q. On the basis of the evidence with reference to the Oatis case in this record, Professor, could any reasonable thinking human being come to any conclusion other than the conclusion that Oatis was guilty as he was charged of being, as he confessed to being, and as he was convicted of being?

Mr. Lenvin: I really ought to let him answer that question, but I object.

Mr. Brown: The objection is sustained.

9981 **William Garfield Cummings** resumed the witness stand, and having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:

Direct Examination—cont'd.

9982 Q. Did you attend different types of meetings? A. I did.

Q. Will you tell the Panel about these various types of meetings? A. I attended secret meetings, I attended the National Convention, I attended the State Conventions, I attended local conventions, secret conventions. I also attended the membership meetings that were
9983 held in the city of Toledo, Ohio, and I attended the CP trade union meetings.

Q. Were there any other types? A. I attended meetings where there was discussion held on the secrecy of the Communist organization.

Q. Mr. Cummings, directing your attention to your previous testimony about meetings you attended in Cleveland, Ohio in 1948, how did you receive notice that a meeting was to be held in Cleveland? A. The way we received notice in Toledo that a meeting was going to be held in Cleveland was by courier. After we arrived in Cleveland to attend these particular meetings we would go to the Communist Party headquarters, and there
9984 we would be given—

The Witness: We would arrive in Cleveland, Ohio and go to the Communist Party office and there Mrs. Helen Kirchmarek would give us directions as to just where the meeting was going to be held. That is the way we received the final instructions about where the meeting was to be.

By Mr. Nelson:

Q. Was this always the practice whenever a meeting was to be held in Cleveland? A. This was not always the practice. This started in 1948. At one time she could tell you orally where the meeting was going to be held, and later they didn't trust their officers in the Communist Party office and said we should write it on paper.
9985

Q. How long was this practice in effect? A. It started in 1948 and remained until I was out of the Communist organization in 1949, May 9, 1949.

.

Q. What methods were used in the Communist Party in Lucas County to hold such meetings? A. Practically the same methods that were used on the state scale were used on the local county scale. Meetings were held in groups of one or two on street corners, in parks, et cetera.

9986 Q. Mr. Cummings, directing your attention to your previous testimony about your attendance at the National Midwest Communist Party training school in Chicago in December 1946, I believe it was—A. That is right.

.

Q. What instructions if any were given you while you attended this school? A. Mrs. Caroline Drews gave instructions (that we were not to use any of the mail boxes near the school for sending our mail, that we weren't to call our homes by telephone. We weren't to use our last names in classes. I think that is about all on secrecy.

Q. Mr. Cummings, you previously testified that you were a member of the State Committee of Ohio. How long were you a member of this committee? A. I was a member of the State Committee from 1944 until 1946.

9987 Q. Did you resign from the committee? A. I did not resign from the committee.

Q. Why were you not on the committee thereafter? A. For security reasons the committee was reduced.

.

9988 Mr. Brown: What were the circumstances, Mr. Cummings, by which you were no longer a member of this committee?

The Witness: The circumstances were that there was a directive handed down from the National Committee of the Communist Party to reduce the size of all committees,

and at the State Committee meeting in 1948 that is where the reduction took place. We were told by Gus Hall—We were read the directive from the National Committee by Mr. Gus Hall, who was Chairman of the Communist Party of the State of Ohio, and they said this committee must be reduced for security reasons.

Q. Will you tell the Panel where and when this occurred? A. This was in, I believe July of 1948, and the meeting was held on Buckeye Road. I can't recall the exact address of the hall, but it was the East Side Hungarian Hall and the number ran into five figures.

Q. You were present? A. I was present.

Q. Did Gus Hall state why these committees were being reduced? A. Oh, yes, he did. He said it was being 9989 reduced for security reasons, that a directive was handed down from the National Committee of the Communist Party that they should be reduced, that it was a "must."

Q. At the time that you yourself were a member of the State Committee how many members were on the State Committee? A. I will say there were about 42 members.

Q. Do you know what the Committee was reduced to? A. It was reduced to—I can't recall just what it was reduced to. I believe it was around 12 or 14, something like that.

Q. Speaking of the State Committee, were there any other committees reduced? A. The County Committee was also reduced. The County Executive Committee was also reduced. The State Executive Committee was also reduced.

Q. Were any reductions made in other organizations and units of the Party? A. The membership organizations were always reduced to not more than three or four members.

Q. At this time, in addition to being a member of the State Committee, were you in charge of any Communist unit or group? A. I was in charge of the Eighth Ward

Group, what we referred to as the Eighth Ward.

9990 Group.

Q. Prior to this reduction in the State Committee how many members did you have in the Eight Ward Group or branch? A. Approximately 60, approximately 60.

Q. Prior to 1948 how did this group meet? A. They met in a group, in a group.

Q. The entire membership would meet in a group? A. That is right.

Q. After the reduction of the State Committee was anything done with this Eighth Ward Branch of which you were chairman? A. It was reduced to that they only met in groups of no more than two or three.

Q. Where did they meet? A. They met in various homes in the Eighth Ward.

Q. How was notice of these meetings given after the branch was reduced? A. After the reduction of the branches Mr. Joe Sokol would go around and tell these two or three members where there was going to be a meeting and what time they were supposed to be there, not to come two together, but one at a time, to go around to the back door, or something like that, until the three or four arrived at the particular meeting.

9992 Q. Mr. Cummings, you described the secret meetings. What was the distinction between the secret meetings and the so-called open meetings? A. The secret meetings were meetings where only the Communist Party members were allowed to attend. The open meetings were more or less open mass meetings where Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers could attend.

9993 What occurred at these secret meetings?

The Witness: I will give you for example at the home of Charlie Clark, 2647 Mulberry Street, where Miss

9994 Elizabeth Gurley Flynn came in the city of Toledo. There was a special meeting. That is where the over-all secrecy of the Communist Party in Lucas County began. That is where she gave the instructions that the National Committee had instructed her to cover a certain part of the country and to inform the Communist leaders that they should not use the telephone for calling Communist members, that Communist documents and directives should not be sent through the mails, that you should not use the names of the Communists over the telephone, and that you should not carry lists of names of Communists on your person.

Mr. Marcantonio: When? We didn't get the time.

The Witness: That was about July of 1947, about July of 1947.

By Mr. Nelson:

Q. What was Miss Elizabeth Gurley Flynn's position in the Communist Party? A. At that time she was Chairman of the Women's Commission; I believe, at that particular time.

Q. The Women's Commission of the National Party? A. Of the National Party, that is right.

Q. Did the Club or branch carry out these instructions? A. Those instructions were carried out. That was in 1947.

9995 Q. Mr. Cummings, where did the Party have its offices in Toledo? A. Well, in 1949 the office was 501-1/2 Monroe Street. It was several different places. They moved around in Toledo there.

Q. You were frequently in the office? A. Oh, yes, I was frequently in the office.

Q. In your position in the Party did you take any part in the running of the office? A. I did.

Q. Were you in any sense in charge of the office? A. I was in charge of the office.

Q. And the equipment there? A. And the equipment.

Q. Was all the Party office equipment maintained at the Party Office? A. Not in 1949, no.

Q. It was moved? A. Some of it was moved.

Q. Did you have any part in moving it? A. My car 9996 was used in the moving of the equipment.

Q. Did you have any part in discussions about moving this equipment? A. I did.

Q. Will you tell us what was said at these discussions?

Q. Who did you have these discussions with? A. The discussions were led by Joe Sokol, who was Chairman of the Communist Party of Lucas County—

Q. And where? A. Just a moment. And Max Wall, Flo Wall, Regina Sokol, Charlie Clark, and myself were on this committee. The discussion was all between us, and the meetings were held, one meeting was held at the home of Max Wall, 147 Maumee Avenue, Toledo, Ohio. At this particular meeting Mr. Sokol said that he had received instructions or a directive from the Communist Party not to maintain the office equipment such as mimeograph machines in the office, that they should be stored in the homes of secret members where they could be used secretly.

At this meeting it was agreed that one of the machines 9997 would be stored at the home of Curley Swan, who worked at the Dana Corporation of the Spicer Manufacturing Company, and he was somewhat of a secret member. The other machine would be stored at the home of Charlie Clark, 2647 Mulberry Street, who also worked at the Dana Corporation of the Spicer Manufacturing Company. Curley Swan is what he was known by, but his name was John Swan.

Q. These discussions were with fellow members of the County Committee and led by the Chairman, Joe Sokol?

A. That is right, fellow members of the County Committee.

Q. Did this take place after Elizabeth Gurley Flynn gave you these previous instructions? A. It did. It took place after they gave the instructions.

Mr. Forer: May we now get the date when this took place?

The Witness: I can't give you the exact date, but Elizabeth Gurley Flynn—it was in July of 1947 that Elizabeth Gurley Flynn came to Toledo, and I believe that this meeting took place on Wednesday following the Tuesday that she came to Toledo:

By Mr. Nelson:

Q. Having taken part in this discussion, did you take part in carrying out what was decided upon? A. I was the driver of the car that carried the machines.

9998 Q. Just where did you take the machines? A. From the office one machine was carried out to the home of Curley Swan, and the other was taken out to the home of Charlie Clark, 2647 Mulberry Street.

Q. Did you ever actually see these machines in these two homes? A. Not only did I see the machines in the two homes, but I have driven in the alley of both of these homes at night to help run off Communist literature on those machines.

Q. During this time the Communist Party had an official office in Toledo? A. 501-1/2 Monroe Street.

10001 Q. Wait a minute, Mr. Cummings. You were asked if you were taught anything about what your duties as a member of the Communist Party of the United States would be in the event of a war between the United States and Russia? A. I was.

Q. Where were you taught this? A. At the Midwest Training School in Chicago, Illinois, in December of 1945.

Q. Who taught you this? A. George Siskind.

Q. What was his position? A. His position was National Educational Director of the Communist Party.

Q. What subjects did he teach in the school? A. 10002 He taught—I will have to refresh my memory. There are so many subjects, if you are asking for all.

Q. We will particularize on the point we are on. What did he teach on the subject of what a Communist Party member should do in the event of a war between the United States and Russia, a member of the Communist Party of the United States? A. He taught—I think I will approach it this way—George Siskind said that around the turn of the century the capitalist forces of the world had reached a point where the only way that they could continue was to create a war. He said that the uneven development of Germany over the United States and England, that the United States and England had to start a war to regain some of the world's markets, because of uneven development that Germany had taken most of the world markets. He said that is what brought about the war, World War I. He said the same thing brought about World War II. He said that World War II was a capitalist war until the Soviet Union was attacked, and he said when the Soviet Union was attacked then it became a people's war. He said that the Communist forces throughout the world owed their allegiance and support to the Soviet Union. That is what he taught in regard to the Soviet Union, that the Communist Party throughout the world, not just in America, but throughout the world, owed their allegiance to the Soviet Union.

10003 Mr. Brown: Did Mr. Siskind say that you people owed your allegiance to the Soviet Union rather than to the United States?

10004 The Witness: I believe I said—I was putting it in Mr. Siskind's words. Those are things that George Siskind said. That is what he said.

Q. What did Mr. Siskind say about the United States Government as constituted at that time, if anything?

Mr. Brown: I think it is a leading question.

Did Mr. Siskind teach anything else with regard to this specific subject matter?

The Witness: He taught that the American Government was an imperialist government.

Mr. Brown: Is that all he taught—

The Witness: Oh, no.

Mr. Brown: —on this subject?

By Mr. Nelson:

Q. On this subject. A. He taught that the American Government was an imperialistic government, and the Communist Party was struggling to eliminate imperialism throughout the world.

10025 Q. Mr. Cummings, directing your attention to your past testimony that you attended the State Convention of the Communist Party in Ohio in July 1948, who was the principal speaker at this convention? A. William Z. Foster.

Q. What was his position in the Party? A. He was Chairman of the Communist Party of the United States of America.

Q. Can you tell us the substance of his remarks?
10026 Were you present at this convention? A. I was present at the convention.

Q. Can you tell us the substance of his remarks? A. He gave a very short report. The reason he gave a short report was on account of his physical condition. One of the statements that he made, he said that the Communist Party in the State of Ohio should be very careful in picking their leadership, that they should pick men that they could depend on in case of war between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Q. Mr. Cummings, were you ever present at any Communist Party meetings when the Universal Military Training Program of the United States was discussed? A. Several.

Q. Will you particularize on one meeting where it was held, who attended, their official status in the Party? A. I attended one such meeting in Lucas County. Joe Sokol, Mr. Joe Sokol, who was Chairman of the Communist Party of Lucas County at that time, led the discussion at this meeting. This meeting was held at 147 Maumee Avenue, at the home of Max and Flo Wall.

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. Give us the approximate date, if you can. A. The approximate date, about June, I believe, 1948. The attendance at this meeting were Joe Sokol, Regina Sokol, Max Wall, Flo Wall, Melvin Dahlmann, and Edwin Brooks.

By Mr. Nelson:

Q. What was the nature of the discussion? A. The nature of the discussion was the position of the Communist Party relative to UMT Universal Military Training, which is referred to as UMT.

Q. Were any decisions made? A. There were decisions made, yes.

Q. What was decided? A. It was decided that two youths would go out and picket the building or house of the four local draft boards of Lucas County. Two youths were chosen. They were Melvin Dahlmann and Edwin Brooks. They went out to picket it.

Q. What was the purpose of the picketing? A. The picketing was to try to stop the youths from registering for UMT, Universal Military Training.

Q. Was anything said as to why the Party didn't want the American youth to register? A. Joe Sokol made the statement that, he said, the Communist Party should do everything they could to keep the youth from registering for military training because the United States Army should be kept at as low an ebb as possible. He said the money should be spent to better the conditions of the working people of the United States instead of for UMT.

Q. Did these two men, Brooks and Dahlmann, actually do any picketing? A. They did.

Q. What were you taught was the primary objectives of the Communist Party?

10029 The Witness: We were taught that the primary objective of the Communist Party was to infiltrate trade union movements, Negro organizations, and any organization that we were able to get into and take control of, to eventually change the system of the American Government.

10126 Philip E. Mosely resumed the witness stand, and having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:

Cross Examination—cont'd

10148 Q. Professor, on the basis of your testimony with reference to Duclos and the assumptions which you would make and did make as to its authoritative character of any statement or speech or article by Duclos, wouldn't you have to say on the basis of the same reasoning that prior to 1940, at least, Browder, Foster, and Green, to use your words, appeared regularly as spokesmen for the international organization of the Communist Party? A. That would be a logical conclusion, but there is this factor which in practice is difficult to evaluate, and that is that at any given time the Executive Committee of the Communist International might prefer to introduce this or that new definition of policy through one person and not another.

Q. You would have no knowledge of that? A. No, I would have no knowledge of that.

Q. No knowledge of it whatsoever? A. No, I don't claim knowledge of that.

Q. It would be speculative on your part to make
10149 that statement, would it not? A. I merely say that
there is the general impression that some interna-
tional Communist spokesmen were regarded as serving
more often as a means of stating authoritatively an inter-
pretation of policy of the Executive Committee.

Q. That is just a general impression, as you described it,
right? A. Yes, based on the relative frequency with which
this or that person might be the one to give the interpreta-
tion of the line. A person who occupied a high parliamen-
tary position, for example, would be more impressive and
effective means of communication for public purposes.

Q. You are just expressing your own judgment on this
question now, aren't you? A. You asked me to express my
judgment.

Q. No, I asked you whether your statement was based on
a general impression, which is what you said it was based
on. A. Well, based on a careful reading of the published
materials and an attempt to try to see the pattern. For
instance, members of the executive committee coming from
countries where the Communist Party was either outlawed
or underground would not have the same advantage of a
rostrum with wide resonance as would, for example, a lead-
ing figure of the French Chamber.

10153 Q. Then you said, after a long colloquy, at 4953:
"The second instance which I recall immediately
and in detail, is that Monsieur Duclos inaugurated a very
strong campaign of the French Communist Party against
the Marshall Plan by his major speech at a large
10154 public gathering in Paris in August 1947."

10155 Q. Would it not be correct, then, to say that in
making this speech Duclos—and I am now using
the words you used on direct testimony—was acting as the
spokesman of his own party, the Communist Party, in
French public life, in making that speech? A. That is

correct in large part. In the case of a man of his eminence in the international movement it is difficult to separate the two. Since no contradictions have appeared publicly in the two roles it is hard to see how it is possible to separate one from the other. Only a little over a month later Monsieur

Duclos attended the founding meeting of the Com-10156 munist Information Bureau and again took an active part there in re-establishing a center of guidance to the International Communist movement.

Q. You say it is difficult to make that distinction? A. I think it is very hard to see just where you are going to draw the line when the two roles are intermingled in the same person and the line of thinking is identical.

Q. Didn't you make the distinction yourself, Professor, in your direct testimony? Look at transcript 4948, the bottom of the page. You refer to "A man"—that is Duclos, is it not? "who had served frequently as the spokesman of his own party in the French Chamber and in French public life and his public writings and who prior to 1943 and after 1947 appeared regularly as a spokesman for the International Organization of the Communist Party."

You made that distinction, did you not? A. I made the description rather than the distinction. In other words, the two roles seemed to be fused.

10180 Q. Professor, I have here from the Library of Congress a volume consisting of the issues of Humanite from August 23, 1944, to December of 1945, and I myself have examined all of the issues in this volume for the month of March, and I have not found in any of those issues any reference to a visit by Duclos to Moscow during that period.

I would like to ask you, with the permission of the Panel, not to take time during the hearing itself here today, but during a recess of the hearing, to examine the issues of Humanite for the month of March so that you will be in a position to state whether or not your recollection is accurate and whether or not there is any news article or

other story in Humanite for the month of March, 1945, indicating that Duclos during that month had been in Moscow.

10187 Mr. Brown: Under the circumstances, I will ask Dr. Mosely if he will be kind enough to look through these issues of Humanite which appear in the bound volume which Mr. Abt has presented.

Mr. Lenvin: Before you do that, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you what. I will agree and we will stipulate to strike from the record his answer.

Mr. Brown: All right.

Mr. Marcantonio: Let's indicate where the answer appears on the record, so that there will be no misunderstanding.

Mr. Abt: Let me state it, if you will, and see if you agree.

It is now stipulated between counsel for the Petitioner and the Respondents that the following portions of

10188 the witness' testimony on direct-examination be stricken: They appear on page 4949 of the transcript, starting with lines 12 and 13, the testimony or language, "However, a few weeks before the article was published by Monsieur Duclos he returned to Paris from Moscow."

And then the entire colloquy which follows, between myself and Mr. LaFollette, will be stricken, which is lines 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20. And then the witness' answer, lines 21 and 22, as follows:

"From the French Communist newspaper, Humanite, of that time, March 1945."

Do you so stipulate, Mr. Lenvin?

Mr. Lenvin: Yes, I so stipulate.

10302 Q. Now look at the second column, top of the page, 214-A, which is the Zhdanov report, "The International Situation," is it not? A. Yes.

Q. Does he not say with reference to the new democracies, in the last sentence of the first partial paragraph of the column, "As a result, the peoples of these countries have not only torn themselves from the clutches of imperialism, but are paving the way for entry onto the path of socialist development."

He so states, does he not? A. Yes, he so states.

Q. Does he say they are paving the way for entry onto a new path of socialist development? A. He does not so state.

Q. Is there anything in this article that states that these people's democracies are entering onto a new path of socialist development? A. The significance of this passage in Zhdanov's speech was that he used the expression, "Are paving the way for entry onto the path of socialist development," because over a period of some months it became clear from the developments as well as the resulting shifts in interpretation that this was a signal for the conclusion of the period of coalition rule in the people's democracies.

Q. That it was what? A. That this was the signal for ending the period of coalition rule on the assumption that it would be permanent.

Q. I am sorry I can't follow you. A. The coalition rule was based on the assumption that it would be permanent, because if you were a coalition only long enough to destroy the partners in the coalition, that is not exactly a conducive atmosphere to mutual confidence within the coalition. The Zhdanov speech and the Cominform founding meeting at which it was delivered thus come in retrospect to represent the speeding up of the process of establishing the monopoly of Communist power in these countries in order to strengthen their further integration into the Soviet sphere and also to speed up the development along lines similar to the Soviet system in political and economic respects. Thus you put your finger on the very passage which probably has most significance in this speech as far as concerns the evolution of the so called people's democracies.

Q. I may have put my finger on a significant
10304 passage, but you have not answered my question,
which was, does Zhdanov in this passage or any-
where else in the report describe people's democracy as a
new path to socialism. A. He describes them as paving the
way for entry onto the path of socialist development.

Q. Yes, but he does not say that the path of people's
democracies is a new path to socialism, does he? A. No,
he is marking the abandonment of that slogan and the shift
to emphasis on a single path to socialism, the Soviet path.

Q. Professor, you said just a moment ago that this report
of Zhdanov's was the signal for the abandonment of the
coalition form of government and for, as I understood
you, to paraphrase you roughly, for the taking over of
the governments by the Communist Party, isn't that right?

A. Where it had not already occurred.

10528 Q. Could not, Professor, an informed American
observer, basing his opinion on what he believed
to be the best interests of his country, reasonably come to
to the independent conclusion that the Truman Doctrine
and the Marshall Plan conflicted with the best interests
of the United States?

Mr. Sheehan: Objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

10549 Q. Professor, could not an independent American
observer, unbiased and objective observer, come to
the conclusion in the spring of 1949 that the North Atlan-
tic Pact was inimical to the peace and security of the
American people for the reasons set forth in the editorial
and in the statement of the National Committee?

Mr. Sheehan: Objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

10794 Q. Have you heard of Mr. Youngjeung Kim—
Mr. Lenvin: I object.

Mr. Marcantonio: Just a moment. —Youngjeung Kim, president of the Korean Affairs Institute in the United States.

Mr. Lenvin: I object.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. The Korean Affairs Institute is not a Communist organization, is it?

Mr. Lenvin: Same objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. In fact, it is known to be highly conservative?

10795 Mr. Lenvin: Objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. But did not Mr. Youngjeung Kim state in a letter published in the New York Times August 12, 1947, as follows: "In South Korea there is little law and order. The last election of the South Korea interim legislative assembly was carried out in such improper manner that even some of the officials were not aware that an election was being held."

Did he not so state?

Mr. Lenvin: Objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. And did he not state in a letter printed in the New York Herald Tribune, May 20, 1950, "It is a well known fact that the Government of South Korea maintains itself with military and police power."

Mr. Lenvin: Objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. Did not an article by Allen Raymond in the New York Herald Tribune, May 5, 1948, state, "South Korea is obviously in the hands of rightist groups bent on rule as arbitrary as that of Generalissimo Franco's Spain"?

Mr. Lenvin: Same objection.

10796 Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. Did not a dispatch by Walter Sullivan of the New York Times of March 6, 1950, state, "Large sections of South Korea are darkened today by a cloud of terror that is probably unparalleled in the world. It is universal shadowing the lives of police, peasants and guerillas alike."

Mr. Lenvin: Objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. Is it not true that on December 1, 1947, the New York Times reported that there were 10,000 political prisoners in South Korean jails?

Mr. Lenvin: Objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. And on September 6, 1949, the New York Times carried a report of the South Korean Home Ministry giving the prison population of South Korea as 36,000—16,000 more than capacity?

Mr. Lenvin: Objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. Do not all these statements closely parallel the views of Mr. Clark and Mr. Malik in Exhibits 286 and 281?

Mr. Lenvin: Objection.

10797 Mr. Brown: Sustained.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Does that prove or have any tendency to prove that the authors of these statements are dominated or controlled by the Soviet Union?

Mr. Lervin: Same objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

10850 Q. It is a fact, is it not, that there was in this country and elsewhere almost universal welcoming of Mr. Malik's speech of June 23, 1951, opening a possibility of achieving peace in Korea, is that correct?

Mr. Lervin: Objection.

10851 Mr. Brown: Sustained.

10858 Q. In your opinion, could an informed American observer basing his views on what is the best interest of the American people reasonably and sincerely conclude, one, that Mr. Malik's proposal was a great service to the cause of peace and in the best interests of the American people as well as all of the people of the world; two, that the representatives of the American government attempted to frustrate Mr. Malik's proposal but were forced into truce negotiations by the overwhelming desire of the people; and three, that American representatives by provocative conduct and various pretexts attempted to cause the breakdown of armistice negotiations in Korea?

Mr. Lervin: Objection.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

10870 Q. And in view of the parallel between the Malik proposal and the Johnson resolution, does this indicate in your mind and by your standards that the Communist Party of the United States dominates and controls the foreign policy of the Soviet Union?

Mr. Lenvin: What? I object to the question even though I don't understand it.

Mr. Brown: Sustained.

Miss McHale: Dissent.

10871 Miss McHale: I would like an answer for this reason. It is a two way street, so to speak, and I
10872 would like to know the direction.

The Witness: I have been giving expert testimony on the basic analysis, point of view and policy recommendations of the Communist Party of the United States, and those contained in the foreign policy of the Soviet Government. I have not given expert testimony on what dominates what. I feel that the kind of evidence which has been presented as illustrations of the points of view is designed to show how each party of the two thought, analyzed and recommended. I have never testified that because one says "A" and the other says "A" at approximately the same time, and on the same general subject, that one is dictating to the other. If I gave an expert opinion on the issue of whether the Communist Party of the United States dominated, through favoring the position presented in the Johnson resolution, the Soviet Government, when the Soviet Government instructed Mr. Malik to make his speech of June 23, I would be claiming an expert knowledge of the system of communication between the Communist Party in the United States on the one hand, and the Soviet Government on the other, and I feel that I should remain within that sphere in which I have requested to give expert testimony.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. So, therefore, you now state that it has not been your intention to testify as to domination where you
10873 show that one party takes the same position as another party on a given subject and approximately the same period, is that correct? A. My testimony has

been directed toward analyzing the basic line of thinking analysis and advocacy in the case of the Communist Party statements, and the statements of the Soviet Government.

Q. But as you said a moment ago, that it did not show domination of one over the other? A. No, I have not stated that. I have merely stated that as an expert, I would want to consider fully the question of whether I could and should properly as an expert give testimony on the question of communication between the Communist Party of the United States, and the Soviet Government. If I am placed under subpoena to give that kind of testimony, I will, of course, give it when it is convenient for the panel.

11098 **Balmes Hidalgo** called as a witness for Petitioner, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Mr. Brown: Take the stand, please.

Direct Examination

11106 Q. Now, I would like to direct your attention to the spring of 1947. Was there any particular
11107 Marxist book which was being studied in the educational periods at that time? A. There was one book we were studying. It was "State and Revolution."

Q. "State and Revolution." By whom? A. Lenin.

Q. Do you remember any of the discussion periods that took place at this general period on that book? A. I remember one discussion that took place.

Q. Where did that discussion take place? A. It was at a meeting held at the apartment of Abner Levine.

Q. Do you recall where that apartment was located? A. It was located on West 81st Street, New York City.

Q. Who was Abner Levine? A. He was a member of the Executive Committee of the Tom Paine Club.

Q. Do you recall the main subject of that discussion? A. The main subject was a quotation from the book read by Betty, Executive of that Club, who was the Chairman of

the Club reading the discussion. The replacement of the Bourgeois by the Proletarian—

11109 Q. Will you tell us just what went on at the meeting in your own words?

The Witness: She quoted from the book and said that the replacement of the bourgeois by the Proletariat could not be accomplished without violent revolution. She went further to say that we as Communists knew this to be the truth, but if we were accused of this we would say no we don't advocate this, we merely predict this.

11110 The Witness: We were always instructed in the Party by all the executives and afterwards I instructed never to give your last name, only your first name, a false one if need be. And never ask a person for his last name. Take his first name given to you at face value.

By Mr. Sheehan:

Q. After this discussion period, or rather during this discussion period, who was the highest officer in the Thomas Jefferson section at this time? A. The section organizer of that Thomas Jefferson section, who at this time was a man named Julie.

Q. Did Julie have a last name? A. At the time I did not know it.

Q. Did you ever find out what it was? A. I found out that at times he was known as Julie Katz, and other times he was known as Julie O'Donnell.

Q. Did Julie address any meeting at which you were present? A. Yes, he attended that same meeting at which this discussion took place.

Q. And what did he say at that meeting to the best of your recollection? A. He told us that he had been sent into

that section because there was entirely too much looseness in that section, there was a leak somewhere, and he didn't want to see or hear anyone using a person's last name in any communications, not to use the telephone at 11112 all, and if there was no other way of communication and the telephone had to be used, to make it as brief and short as possible, and after a time to try to get away from using even first names, to try and use the numbers of the Party cards.

Q. You said that this man Julie told you why he had been sent into the section. A. Yes.

Q. When was he sent into the section? A. That was his first meeting when he told us that.

Q. What was the next meeting after this that you recall?

A. I recall having attended a Party Congress later 11113 on that year at the City Center, I believe it was, in New York City, New York.

Q. Can you tell us approximately when that was? A. In the spring of '47, about June of 1947, I would say.

Q. Do you recall any of the speakers at this meeting? A. Yes, I recall them.

Q. Whom do you recall? A. I recall Bob Thompson. At the time he was State Chairman of the Communist Party of the State of New York.

Q. Will you tell the panel briefly what Mr. Thompson had to say at this meeting? A. He spoke, one of the things he said was that the world was divided into two parts, on one side we had the imperialistic nations and on the other side, as he put it, we had the truly democratic countries of the world, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, all led by the USSR.

Q. After you attended the Party Congress, did you thereafter attend any meetings of the club? A. Yes.

Q. And what club was that now? A. The Charles Krumbein Club, originally Club No. 2. It had now been given a name, Charles Krumbein.

Q. I would like to direct your attention to November of 1947. At that time, did you have a membership 11114 card in the Communist Party? A. In November 1947, yes, I had a card in the Party.

Q. What happened to your membership card? A. I gave that card to my club membership director. Do you want me to name her?

Q. Yes. A. Ann Greenfield.

Q. And at what time was that you gave her your card? A. In November of that year.

Q. Do you recall where it was that you turned over your card to Ann Greenfield? A. It was at a meeting held at the apartment of Georgette Taggart.

Q. Did you have a conversation with Ann Greenfield at this time? A. Yes, she took me aside and told me that I would have to hand in my own card, that it was a directive from a high group. She would give me a new card with a new number, and suggested that I put an entirely different name on this new card.

Q. Did you put another name on that card? A. Yes, I did.

Q. What name did you use? A. Bernard Harris.

Q. I direct your attention to the early part of 11115 1948. Do you recall any changes in the administration of your section around that period? A. Yes, I recall one change.

Q. Will you tell the Panel briefly how you learned of this change? A. The section organizer at that time was a man by the name of Morty Kamen. He called me aside and told me that from there on any names, addresses and phone numbers in my roster, I at the time was section press director, would have to be kept in a different manner. He told me to keep them in some sort of code, using numbers and symbols so if that book were to fall into the hands of any unauthorized persons the identity of those members would be a secret. It would not be disclosed.

Q. Did he tell you that this method— A. He told me. He suggested the method, and he told me this was the method being used by the regional directors, region of the Upper West Side—

11116 Q. Did he tell you why it was so important that the identities were not revealed? A. In case of the Party going underground.

Q. Did he say anything at a later date about how members were to go about concealing their identity—

11117 The Witness: I was told to immediately just give our name and address and ask for a lawyer, talk to the Civil Rights Congress, refuse to let ourselves or our houses be entered or searched without a search warrant, refuse to be arrested without a warrant, and to refuse to give any names and addresses of any other persons, and to refuse to admit to being a member of the Communist Party.

By Mr. Sheehan:

Q. Where and when did he tell you these things? A. He told us at a meeting held at the section headquarters at 72nd Street in New York City.

Mr. Abt: May we have the date, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Brown: Do you recall the date, Mr. Hidalgo?

The Witness: The date was in July. Associat-
11118 ing it with other things, I would say it was July 22.

Mr. Brown: What year?

The Witness: 1947.

Mr. Brown: Very well.

By Mr. Sheehan:

Q. About how many members attended this meeting, do you recall? A. No, I don't recall exactly the number. They were composed of delegates of every club in the sec-

tion. It was a section conference. Not a conference, but a convention.

Q. Do you recall Mr. Kamen speaking to a section at a later date?

(No response.)

Q. If you don't recall— A. Not at the moment, I don't.

Q. I won't belabor the point. You previously testified that you were a member of the Charles Krumbein Club of the Thomas Jefferson section. Was that club divided up into any groups or other divisions? A. Yes, it was.

Q. Will you tell the Panel briefly what they were? A. It was composed of several groups, approximately five or six groups, each approximately of five, six or seven members. Each group was in charge of a group captain. The captains were in the main the executives of that club, the club organizer, the club press director, the club membership director, and so forth.

Q. Did anybody tell you what was the purpose of the club being broken up into these groups?

The Witness: We were told the purpose of it was again if we went underground, it would be a lot easier for one person to contact five others. He would only have to remember five names and addresses. He would not have to carry any list.

By Mr. Sheehan:

Q. Who told you this and when was it? A. The speaker was Rita Stevens.

Q. And where did she tell you? A. It was at a meeting of one of the club meetings.

11120 Q. What position did Rita Stevens hold in the Communist Party, if any? A. She was a member of the executive of that club. She was a club membership director.

11121 Q. Do you recall anything further being said
at this meeting regarding this subject of going
11122 underground, to use the term that was used there?

A. In the case of the Party going underground, we were told that it would be so much easier if all the functioning of the Party was done through a group system, somewhat like she had mentioned, the five persons being contacted, say, by the club organizer, and all the club organizers being contacted by one member of the section, five or six members of the section being contacted by one member of the county. In that case the most that any one person would know would be the names and addresses of five persons, and he refused to tell them if he had been instructed to do so—

Q. Did someone other than Rita Stevens speak at this meeting on that subject? A. Yes. That last statement was told to us by Mortie Kamen, rather by the membership director of the section, Nell Greenfield, who was also at that particular meeting.

11124 Q. Will you tell us what you were taught in your classes? You told us you attended school. Will you tell us what you were taught during your classes about the objectives of the Party?

The Witness: The objectives of the Party were to fight for socialism here in this country.

By Mr. Sheehan:

Q. By what means was that to be done?

11126 The Witness: We were taught to use any means possible, but as we were taught by their own textbooks, the only method could be by force and violence. That was the only method taught to us as being a possibility.

11149 **John Lautner** called as a witness for Petitioner, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Direct Examination

11157 Q. Who operated the school to which you have just referred? A. The National Hungarian Bureau.

Q. Who were the instructors in this school? A. Bebrits, James Lusztig, John Szanto, Louis Weinstock,

11158 Antonio Wexler, and Louis Engdahl, E-n-g-d-h-a-l.

Q. It is d-a-h-l, isn't it? A. Engdahl, yes.

Q. Did John Gyetvai teach there? A. Yes, Dr. John Gyetvai. Joseph Feher.

Q. What languages were used in the school? A. Both Hungarian and English.

Q. Can you tell the Panel what courses these men taught? A. Lusztig taught Marxism-Leninism. Szanto had a course on the decisions of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International and strategy and tactics. Louis Bebrits taught the Communist Manifesto, and he had a special course on labor journalism. J. Peters taught political economy. Antonio Wexler the Paris Commune. J. Feher, sick and death benefits, administration of the Hungarian Working Men's Benevolent Association. Gus Majer taught present tasks of the Communist Party in relation to the tasks of the Hungarian Bureau of the Communist Party. J. Louis Engdahl gave a series of three lectures on Party policies.

Q. What did Weinstock teach? A. Weinstock taught the history of the Soviet Union, the Bolshevik Party, and the October revolution.

11165 Q. Did the Communist Party policy in trade union matters undergo a change about this time?

The Witness: That change came about in 1933 and '34, and that change came as a result of lessons that the Communist Party as a whole had to draw when Hitler came to power in Germany.

Q. What was the policy of the Party at this time, 1930?

A. At this time it was to build a red revolutionary trade union movement under the leadership of the Profintern.

11192 Q. What significance did you as a section organizer attach to the remarks of Edwards in this particular meeting?

11193 A. Well, the fact that he was already known to us as the representative of the Communist International, we were very attentive to what he had to say, and what he did say was taken as, well, he should know, he is the representative, and what he says is the Party line. There was no questioning of Edwards' judgment.

Q. Do you recall any other meeting, Mr. Lautner, during this period when Edwards or Eisler was present? A. Yes. In 1935, just before they opened Camp Unity, the staff was not there yet. We were called to a meeting to Camp Unity by the District leadership. It could have been the latter part of May or the early part of June, and Eisler or Edwards was present at that meeting, too. This meeting was called by the New York District leadership with the section organizers of New York.

Q. Did he have anything to say? A. Yes. The report at that meeting was given by J. Peters. The report was about the need and necessity on the part of the Party to concentrate on National Guard work at that time, to pay attention to the weekly drills in the National Guard

11194 armories. The District told us in the report—the report was given by J. Peters, who was a member of the National Commission at that time—and he projected

a two pronged approach to this concentration work. One, to make a survey of all Party members who are members of the National Board, and to build Party units within the armories within the Guard, and then in each section where there is an armory to assemble or to organize a concentration unit that will work from the outside on Guard nights, on drill nights, to distribute leaflets in front of the armory and to socialize and get acquainted with Guardsmen. That was the idea that Peters conveyed in this report.

Edwards was present at that meeting at that time.

11196 Q. When was the last time you saw this man?

A. The last time I saw Eisler was shortly before he left on the Batary for Germany. On a number of occasions I once saw him one morning at the Party building at 35 East 12th Street early in the morning, about 9:30. He was looking for somebody on the third floor. I saw him at a banquet once held in New York, the Smorgasbord place on 54th or 55th and Broadway, where Eisler was one of the speakers alongside a number of other Party leaders and other prominent speakers.

Q. Will you fix the time of these two instances? One time you say you saw him in the Party Building, and then the second time was at a banquet. Will you fix the time as nearly as you can?

The Witness: I don't know the exact day, but I can fix the time. It was about two or three weeks after he came out of Ellis Island.

By Mr. Paisley:

11197 Q. Approximately what year? Fix the year. A. '48-'49; '48, I think.

Q. You mean he had been arrested for deportation and was being held on Ellis Island. Is that what you mean?

A. Yes.

Q. When did he leave on the Batary?

The Witness: I think it was the spring of 1949.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. How did you learn that Eisler and Edwards were the same person, do you recall?

The Witness: I ought to know. I know the person. I saw him in the Thirties. I took part in meetings
11198 with him, and the same person turns out to be Eisler.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. I was just asking when you first learned it, if you remember. A. When I first saw him. I didn't know who Eisler was. I didn't know Eisler was identical with Edwards until I saw him.

Q. You had a lot in the papers. A. I knew Eisler after the war, after the Second World War. I didn't know that this Eisler was identical with Edwards. I knew that Edwards was here in the early Thirties. I knew Edwards went to Spain. I didn't know that in the late Forties this same person turns out to be Eisler.

Q. I was just wondering when you first learned it. A. When I first saw him after the War, and that was when he came out of Ellis Island. I didn't see him before that.

11207 Q. When you left the National Headquarters in New York, did you have any understanding with any of the leaders as to how you should communicate with them on Party affairs? A. Yes, I had a number of addresses to communicate. I remember the normal letters were sent to Box 92, Station D. We had an address in the Bronx where we sent letters, where we discussed problems, district problems pertaining to personnel and con-

centration work and application of policies in the coal industry. We used to send it to this Bronx address. And then there were plenums twice a year, organized by the National Committee of the Party, to which plenums I came.

Before I went to West Virginia in the organizational department, they gave me a code that I could use if the situation will arise. It was a very simple code based on two books. I had a copy and Peters had one in the National Office. And I was to use the number system with these books as to line and letters on pages.

Q. Did you talk to Peters about it? A. He told me that I should take it along with me, but I never had occasion to use that. I even asked him, "Why do I need this?" He said, "Well, the other districts have it, so you might as well have it." But I never had occasion to use it.

11208 Q. What was his position at that time? A. He was a member of the organizational department of the National Office at that time.

11209 Q. Were you in West Virginia, Mr. Lautner, when the Hitler-Stalin Pact was first publicized?
A. Yes.

Q. And were you then the district organizer? A. Yes.

Q. Were you called upon by the membership to explain that pact?

The Witness: Yes.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Just how did you explain it?

The Witness: The Hitler-Stalin Non-Aggression Pact and Commercial Treaty, when it was signed, the explanation was that this was a technical move to forestall the efforts of the Chamberlain-Deladier government to bring about a situation where Hitler will attack the Soviet Union at that time. There was a Munich

11210

Pact concluded by Chamberlain and Deladier and Mussolini and Hitler, and it was consistent with the policies of the Soviet Union at that time as enunciated by Litvinov in the League of Nations that the Soviet Union was ready to conclude a non-aggression pact with any nation that is willing to conclude such a pact. So this was the gist of the explanation, that it was a technical move to forestall a situation bringing about an alliance on the attack against the Soviet Union. Stalin made a famous statement that the Soviet Union will not pull out the chesnuts for anybody out of the fire, or anybody's chesnuts out of the fire.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Did this pact come as a surprise to you? A. It did.

11211 The Witness: It was not an emotional surprise.

It was a political surprise. It was a political surprise in this respect: For years the Communist Party endeavored to build an anti-fascist alliance and anti-fascist unity and here comes a pact out of the blue sky running against this whole effort for years, a pact is concluded with the Nazi regime. So this was the political surprise, not the emotional surprise.

Q. What was the reaction of your Party membership in West Virginia on the reversal?

11212 The Witness: First of all the reaction was as follows: The Daily Worker for days had nothing to say. It had nothing to say. I myself didn't believe it at first. I thought it was just another headline sensationalism or something of that sort. But when it was verified that such treaty was concluded, that such alliance was concluded, the explanation was that this was a counter move to the Munich Pact.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. During that period when the Daily Worker was silent, did your Party members interrogate you on the subject? A. I was asked a lot of questions and I told them let us wait to see what the Daily Worker has to say. We hear this on the radio and we read it in the paper, and we will see what the Daily Worker will have to say on this. Some were disgusted. I know when I came into New York shortly thereafter, some of the Party leaders disagreed with this pact, and they left the Party. One of them was the business manager of the Daily Worker, Wishnak, who said he will never endorse or cooperate or work in that kind of a movement that can conclude an alliance with Hitler. That was the business manager of the Daily Worker.

11213 There were some others who disagreed and they also drifted out of the Party. It was a jolt as far as the Party is concerned, and a lot of people did leave the Party at that time. I remember at the National Committee meeting after that when a report was given on Party building, that fact was registered, that the Hitler-Stalin Pact made a dent in the numerical strength of the Party membership.

11224 The Witness: I came to New York to the special convention in November.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Were you a delegate to the convention? A. Yes.

Q. What was the purpose of this special convention? A. This special convention of the Party was called to meet a specific problem that arose, that is, an act was passed in Congress known as the—

11225 The Witness: —the Voorhis Foreign Agent Registration Act. This convention was to meet that

problem, to disaffiliate from the Communist International, which was a move of expediency to get from under this Act.

The Witness: The purpose of this meeting was stated by Earl Browder, who was the Secretary of the
11226 Party at that time.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Did the Party disaffiliate from the Communist International? A. Yes, with this emphasis: That that disaffiliation from the Communist International in no way will affect our attitude, that is the Party's attitude, on the question of proletarian internationalism, and with that understanding the Party disaffiliated from the Communist International.

11240 Q. What length of time was required to complete this schooling? A. The National Training School in 1941 got together at the beginning of February and it lasted all the way to May 1.

Q. In New York City? A. In New York City.

Q. Where was it conducted? A. This school was not conducted in any specific place. It was held in
11241 homes, in various parts of the city, in organized places, that were pre-arranged for sessions from day to day. It never met at the same place more than once or twice.

Q. Was it a full time activity? A. Yes.

Q. Approximately what hours did you attend? A. We had a session usually in the morning, a school session with all the students, with all seven students and an instructor. Then we were broken up into two groups. Then we had group study in the afternoon. Then we also had assignments to write papers on various assigned topics and subjects. I would say from 12 to 14 or 15 hours per day went into study at the National Training School.

11295 Well, after that party I took sick. I had the grippe and I stayed home for about a week . . . When I got up I went out for a walk before I went into the office downstairs, and I saw two people hanging around my house. One of them was John L. Spivack and the other one was the sister-in-law of Abe Isserman.

Q. Who was he? A. John L. Spivack and the sister-in-law of Abe Isserman.

Q. Is that the lawyer Isserman? A. Yes. So I was quite surprised, what should John L. Spivack be doing in this neighborhood.

Q. Who was Spivack? A. Spivack was in charge of security for the legal office at Canal Street for the Party during the trial.

Q. The trial of the eleven? A. The trial of the eleven. John said, Where could I get some films for some 11296 kind of camera he had, around here? I lived on 22nd Street and Seventh Avenue at that time and there was no film place nearby around there for the type of film that he wanted. That was another incident.

Before I went down to the office I went up to 42nd Street and bought some of these pamphlets, and I went down to the office. About a half hour later Jack Kling came into my office.

Q. What was his position? A. He was treasurer of the Communist Party. That was the time I showed him this pamphlet, what Browder said about international relationships and whether he was responsible solely for the Party line projected by Browder. He told me that the national office will ask the state office to release me to go to the Midwest and accelerate preparations in the Midwest for the same type of work that I was doing in New York, in other words, preparations to take the Party underground.

I told him, I don't know. I wouldn't leave New York. He said, "You would work out of New York, but you will spend some time in the Midwest and work with people

there who are carrying on the work out there. You have a lot of experience here in New York, and I think we will benefit by that down there."

So we went in to see Bill Norman. Bob wasn't
11297 around. Bill Norman and Hal Simon agreed that I should be released and work for the national office.

The next day—this was on a Thursday, the 12th of January—

Q. The exact date I don't presume is of importance. A. Jack said that I should go to Cleveland and meet him there on Saturday at one o'clock at the Union Station. That day, Friday, all day long I had a meeting with Hal Simon, with one of the members of the state secretariat. I gave them a full report on the status of the preparations to take the Party underground in New York State, a detailed report, and that was how I spent that day. That same evening I took a train out of New York and arrived in Cleveland Saturday morning. As per agreement with Jack Kling, I checked into the Cleveland Hotel and I was waiting for one o'clock to come around. I went down to the Union Station and I met him around the information center at Union Station in Cleveland.

Q. Was that by pre-arrangement? A. Yes. He told me to check in at the Cleveland Hotel. We had lunch together, and then we took in a show. I think we went to the Hippodrome on Euclid Avenue. He told me that we had to stall for time because the person we were to meet was not available until six o'clock, that he was out of town.

11298 After the show we ate some more and then we walked down to Sinclair Avenue, which is the closest avenue in Cleveland running parallel with the Lake, east. We went out to 95th Street. We got there about 5:30. We still had about half an hour or so. We were walking around. Around six o'clock a car came along, and we got into that car. By that time it was dark. We rode on that boulevard belt from Sinclair Avenue

crossing Superior and Euclid, Woodland, Buckeye, to Kinsman Road. We came down on Kinsman Road, and around the seventies we took a bridge down into that section in the hole known in Cleveland as Kingsbury Run. We were circling around blocks over there and then we went into a house. I was going ahead and Jack was behind me and the driver was behind Jack. Jack told me to go down in the cellar. I was going down in the cellar, and as I looked down there were two persons there playing a card game on a small table. I looked back and Jack wasn't around behind me. He stayed upstairs. These two characters told me to undress. I was puzzled. I didn't know what was happening over here. I looked back and I called for Jack and Jack didn't answer. They were husky guys. I saw on a pile of wood over there long rubber hoses. There were knives. Both of them had guns. I was stripped stark naked. Even my socks were taken off. They went through my clothing. They were searching even in the seams. What they 11299 were looking for I don't know. In my folder they found a few names, and one of them made the remark, "You are a hell of a security officer in the Party going out of town and carrying Party names on you." They were not important names. They were personal friends and personal addresses.

By that time Jack came down with this driver, and following him were Solly Welman from Detroit, a Party leader in Detroit, and Joseph Brand, the Party leader from Ohio.

Q. Had you known those two before? A. I had known them for years. Solly Welman was on the original national review commission and secretary of the original national review commission that was established in 1945 after the reconstitution convention.

I asked them, what is this. I was puzzled. I didn't know what would happen. "You will find out." Then the most abusive and foul language that I have ever heard in the Communist Party. I was called everything under

the sun, a traitor, a spy, a stoolpigeon. I was crying. I said, "A terrible mistake is being made and let's calm down and let's discuss this thing." I was just abused. They wouldn't even listen to me. They had two gadgets there. One was a recording machine, a wire recording machine, and the other one was supposed to be a lie detector. It was a gray little machine with a wire attached, with a ball on the end, and a strip that was fastened to my forearm. I was supposed to hold my hand on the table over there. On the other side of that gadget it was supposed to indicate whether I was telling the truth or not. This chauffeur was the expert on this lie detector.

I was asked, since when was I an agent of the CIA, the Counter Intelligence Agency. I told them I was not an agent of any government organization, that they had to show proof to me that I was. They asked me what was my relationship with Noel & Herman Field, the Field brothers.

Q. Who is Noel, now? A. I don't know who they are. All I know is what I read in the papers, that they disappeared behind the Iron Curtain, that one of them was supposed to be a close friend of—

The Witness: They asked me who did I talk to about the preparations to go underground. I told them that I had an all-day meeting with Hal Simon. I had to go into details of the content of that meeting that I had with Hal Simon. That took almost an hour and a half or two hours.

By Mr. Paisley:

9303 Q. Had you been informing any of the government agencies on the Communist Party? A. No. While I was a member of the Communist Party never was I in contact with anybody, any government agency whatever.

Q. Go ahead. A. They asked me who knows that I was in Cleveland. I told them that a friend of mine in New York

does know. I told them that I wrote a letter to my mother, to Youngstown, Ohio, that I would be in Cleveland and I would be over Sunday afternoon in Youngstown, Ohio to see them. I saw the predicament I was in, and I also told them that I left Jack Kling's name at the hotel desk in case we don't meet each other at Union Station, and if he inquired about me, I would be back in an hour. I didn't leave his name at the hotel desk, but seeing the predicament I was in, I injected that.

Immediately they went upstairs. Joe Brand and Welman and Kling went upstairs. They had a conference for about five or ten minutes, and then they came down. Prior to that I was threatened time and time again that if I don't come clean I will never leave that place. There was a spigot on the side of the basement wall there, and the water was running full blast. There was always trouble with the mike because what I was saying wasn't audible enough. They were replaying it and checking it and testing it. There was another guy behind my back with a gun and he was nudging me to get closer to that loud speaker, to talk louder into that recording machine.

When they came down from upstairs the situation changed immediately. I was told to look down and keep my head down, not to look sideways or any ways, not to look back of me and not to look at the fellows that were behind me. One fellow was hitting the wall all the time with one of these rubber hoses. That also created noise over there that interfered with the recording machine.

Then I was told to sign a statement. The statement was dictated by Jack Kling. They gave me a piece of paper and pencil. The statement said the following, that I, John Lautner, was accused of being a spy and an agent in the ranks of the Communist Party, and that I had a fair hearing, and I was supposed to write that and sign it.

The gun was behind my neck. I did sign such statement.

Q. You say you did? A. I did. Joe Brand got the bright idea that that was in pencil and they had better have it in ink. So I wrote the same statement over again in ink.

Then they packed up their paraphernalia and Jack Kling told me that this hearing will continue, that there are some phases of it that are not clear to them yet, and I was supposed to meet them the next day, Sunday, across from the May Company on Euclid Avenue in a small restaurant, the Mayfair Restaurant. Then they left. They packed up their paraphernalia and left the place. I was left there with the chauffeur of the car and the two other persons who were in the basement when I got there. They gave me back my clothing piece by piece. I begged them, I cried out, I was freezing there in that basement, and they wouldn't give me my clothing back until I was ready to be taken out of there. They gave me back my clothing. Some of my papers were taken away from me. I had that reply from the State Department on me, my passport application. They took that away from me. For the first time in my life I was quite surprised that even money was taken out of my purse, about \$15 were taken out of my purse. I had a pair of gloves that was also not given back to me. Then they pulled my hat down. I was told to keep my head down. I was taken out by the two fellows on their arms into a car, and then driving around about 12 minutes to 15 minutes or so, I remember going across the wooden bridge, I was dumped out at a factory site under a bright light. I was walking along that factory. I was told to go to the end of the factory, and there was a bus stop that would take me downtown to Cleveland.

11304 When they let me out of the car I was afraid that they would shoot me while I was walking away, and I was practically running. I was running. I took a bus. I went downtown. I went up to my hotel room. I was in a daze. I didn't know what had happened. I hoped that this was a way of testing me or something like that because I knew that I was never in contact with any government agency before.

Well, I took the train—first of all, I went there at eleven o'clock in the morning to the appointed place. It was rain-

ing Sunday morning, and they didn't show up. They didn't show up. I waited there for about an hour and a half.

Q. Did Kling stay at the same hotel? A. I don't know where he stayed.

So I took the train and went to Youngstown, Ohio. The next day I took a train and I came back to New York. I picked up the Daily Worker, and there was my expulsion notice with my picture in it. I was charged with trying to protect Angela Calomiris from being expelled from the Communist Party. Angela Calomiris was one of the persons who testified against the 11 in the New York trials.

Q. You mean this was in the Daily Worker? A. Yes. I was further charged that I recommended irresponsible 11305 sible and unreliable persons to work in the defense office.

Q. What defense office? A. In the defense office of the Party that was set up at Broadway and Canal Street during the trial of the eleven.

At the caption of my expulsion there was in bold, large type letters, "Traitor," above my picture.

Q. Did they accuse you of these things out in Cleveland when they were giving you this trial or whatever you want to call it? A. I beg your pardon?

Q. Did they accuse you of these things out there in Cleveland? A. I was not accused. I was branded. I was not charged. I was just branded outright that I am an enemy agent, period. That was the so-called hearing I was supposed to have in that cellar in Cleveland which that expulsion notice referred to, that a special committee was set up by the Party to investigate and give me a hearing. That was the hearing.

Q. You got no other hearing? A. No. I wrote a letter a few days later to Trachtenberg, who was Chairman of the National Review Commission. I told him in that 11306 letter that a terrible mistake was made in my behalf.

The mistake is made, but I want a hearing. I never got a reply to that letter. My brother took that letter up

to his office. It was given to him. I never got a reply to that letter.

11307 Q. Incidentally, when did you go to the FBI?

A. Well, after my expulsion I had some personal problems because of it. I went to stay with my brother. My brother was living at Washington Heights. I stayed with my brother there. Well, I said to reevaluate my whole life in the light of my experience, I had to come to certain conclusions. On the basis of that, finally in 1950, September, toward the end of the month of September, I wrote to the Department of Justice.

Q. September of what year? A. 1950. I told them who I was, and I told them that I am willing to give my full effort, my knowledge about this movement to the services of the Department of Justice. Shortly after that I was contacted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

11326 Q. Were you given any assignment in the Party, Mr. Lautner, in 1946 or 1947 in reorganization work? A. Yes.

Q. Tell the Board what assignment you were given, who gave it to you, and what your duties were. A. After the reconstitution of the Communist Party, the convention as such reaffirmed itself to go back to the Party of a new type based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. This was done in the convention in the form of resolutions, and those resolutions were later elaborated. There were articles written about it, reports given on how to interpret these resolutions in terms of organization, because right after the reconstitution in 1945 the organization as such was intact. There was an election of a new National Committee. After the convention there was a first step in the reorganization. The breaking up in New York County of the large clubs, community clubs, which were the only form of Party lower organization at that time.

11328 The Witness: So these large clubs were broken up into smaller organizations. New sections were established all over New York County, with which I was familiar. The clubs were streamlined. They were known as branches from there on. There was a survey made throughout the Party to seek out those Party members who were employed in industries of various types and industrial sections of the Party were established under the leadership of the New York County leadership. Such industrial sections were in furniture, needle trades, on the waterfront, longshore section, cement section, teamsters section, UE section, industrial section of the Communist Party, machinist section, AFL general industrial section, which included bakers and similar industries that are organized in the American Federation of Labor, building trades section of the Communist Party, New York County, professional sections of various types—those that were in government service, one section, those that were in civil service another section—a section was in the making for the teachers as a special section for teachers in New York County, a special division was created under the hegemony and leadership of the New York State organization known as the Cultural Division of the Party, railroad concentration section was established, and some other sections in which Party members belonging to these various industries were drafted from the various community clubs to which they belonged in the Political Association days, and soon after the Party was reconstituted in 1945.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Was there a commission created to supervise that work? A. The next step was a commission was created to work out for New York County a concentration plan based on this first step that was made. The main concentration task for New York County was transport. That entailed the waterfront, cement, longshoremen, teamsters, railroad and American Railway Express.

11330 Q. Who were on this commission? A. On this commission was Tim Torney, the Executive Secretary of New York County, myself, Lenny Levinson, Louis Sass, and when I left the building trades section to go to Chelsea, Ralph Glick was put in my place on this special commission to reorganize the Party in New York County.

Q. Was that type of reorganization confined to New York County or was it nationwide? A. As far as I am concerned, I was on this commission in New York County, and this plan was initiated by the Party resolutions after the reconstitution of the 1945 convention specifically by John Williamson in one of his reports on concentration work.

Q. Who assigned you to the commission? A. I was assigned by George Blake, New York County Chairman, to work on this Commission for New York County.

Q. How were Communist Party membership records maintained at that time? A. In 1946-47 there were no name records kept in the Communist Party on any level except names of committee members who were known as Communist Party leaders. No branch records as far as names were concerned. However, we had in the Party a yearly registration period where when a Party member

11331 was registered for the following year, there were certain statistics given about the individual, but no name indicated. Just male or female, what industry the person is pursuing, where he is working, what organizations does the person belong to, and what race does the person belong to, white or Negro, and similar general statistics.

The Witness: These statistics were then compiled and only figures were released that so many Party members registered, there is so much more to be registered, the composition of the Party membership is as follows. These were the records kept.

Then besides that there were records kept about the press, the Daily Worker, on branch level, how many Daily Workers the branch distributes, how many subscribers the branch had or got in a drive or campaign, records of that type, but no name records whatever.

11337 Q. Now, Mr. Lautner, you were testifying about how the records were kept after the reconstitution of the Party. I am now confining myself to that period after 1945. Were any records kept of the names of the individuals attending Party meetings? A. No, no names were kept on individual Party members or by Party members.

Q. Were any records kept of the number of persons attending meetings? A. In some instances there might have been a list. I will give you an example. If a national plenum or a convention was called, there was a master list of those that were invited as delegates to the convention, those that were invited as alternate delegates to the convention, and those that were invited as fraternal delegates to the convention.

Q. I am talking about the unit or section meetings. A. No, no lists were kept whatever. Even the unit, the branch, the lowest organization was broken up into groups. There was a group system within the smallest organic part of the Party organization. There was a group system and only the group captain maintained contact with those that were in his or her group. But no list of names
11338 whatever was kept.

Q. Were any records kept of the subscribers to the Daily Worker? A. Subscribers to the Daily Worker, that would be public. The Daily Worker had its own list of subscribers. They had to mail out the Daily Worker to those that subscribed to it. They had their name plates in the Daily Worker offices, and it could be that in some branches they even kept the names of readers of the Daily Worker. But as far as Party members are concerned, there were no names kept on the lower levels.

Q. Were any records kept as to the number of copies sold in a particular district, and the money received from the Daily Worker? A. Oh, yes, these records were kept. Even in the branch they had a press director whose main function was to keep these records about who are in that particular branch territory readers of the Daily Worker. There were records kept on a section level. There was a section press director who kept records about the volume of business that was done in that section territory as to the spreading of the Daily Worker, the list of subscribers, how many bundle orders are taken daily, and how many Daily Workers are distributed in house to house canvassing on Sundays or on weekends. These types of records were kept.

11339 Q. Was there any change in record keeping as you have described it up to the time you left the Party? A. No, the tendency was the other way. For party security, to give the utmost security to the individual in the Party, his name should not be kept by anyone without his or her authorization.

Q. If the Party leaders wanted to locate, say, a house painter in a certain section of the United States; would they be able to do it? How would they go about it?

The Witness: If a Party leader wanted to get in contact with a house painter, how would he go about it?

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Or somebody in the steel industry or on the docks. A. The only way a Party leader could do that was to get down to the specific organizer who was in charge of that particular Party organization where this particular individual would be, and through the organizer, contact him. Unless this particular individual is a personal friend of the Party organizer, then the approach is different. But through organizational channels, it would have to come down to that organizer in whose organization this particular individual was a member.

11340 Q. Did the Party in New York ever issue any instructions while you were active there after the reconstitution of the Party as to what they would say if they were asked whether or not they were members of the Party?

The Witness: Shortly after the indictment of the eleven, an instruction was issued pertaining to the rights of Party members. These instructions came from the law offices of Unger, Friedman and Fleischer on Fifth Avenue, and the instructions said that individual Party members have the protection of the First and Fifth Amendments. In these instructions these amendments were cited. And a telephone number was given in case of any arrest or molestation by authorities to call that particular telephone number which was the phone number of Friedman.

The Party also had a discussion on this problem of safeguarding the individual, and as a result of that, another form was also projected, a small pamphlet informing the individual about his rights in case they are asked by authorities whether they are Party members or other form of molestation, and this pamphlet—

The Witness: This pamphlet was published by the Civil Rights Congress, and was widely distributed in the Party, and also in some of the organizations where the Party had influence, such as the International Workers' Order, and similar organizations.

I reproduced the original legal advice that we got from the offices of Unger, Friedman and Fleischer, and supplied all Party leaders in the New-York State organization with this legal protection, and also with the telephone number that was given to them in case they are approached by authorities about their Party membership.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Now, will you tell the Panel how the Communist Party controlled the attendance at conventions, if they did so?

11342 Q. Tell us also whether you had anything to do with the control of personnel admitted to the meetings of the conventions. A. At the 1948 convention^{of} the Communist Party, the national convention was held in Riverside Plaza, on 73rd Street near Riverside Drive on the West Side. I happened to be in charge of security at the national convention.

Q. Let me stop you and ask you there, what time in 1948 was that convention held? A. 1948, the summer.

Q. Had the eleven leaders of the Party been indicted at that time? A. Yes. In fact, Gil Green was picked up at that convention that morning when the convention assembled, either at home or at the convention, I don't know, but he was picked up that morning. I was in charge of the security of that convention, and here is the way the convention was controlled as far as delegates are concerned.

There must have been a master list somewhere with names—

• • • • •
11343 The Witness: I was told there was a master list by Betty Gannett. ✓

• • • • •
The Witness: Where all the names of the regular delegates, the fraternal delegates, and the alternate delegates were listed. The national org. department placed a number against these names. Our working list on which we checked the delegate coming into the convention, we already checked the individual delegates to their number. This number also corresponded to the number on their delegate ticket. So we checked their three color tickets. For regular delegates they had one color ticket; for alternate delegates they had a different color ticket, and for fraternal delegates and invited guests, they had a different color ticket. All these tickets were numbered. So if it was one ticket color, we knew in what category this delegate was. And we checked every session in the morning and every

session in the afternoon as they came into the convention floor.

We were also instructed in case they left the floor we should also mark the fact that they left the convention floor while the convention was going on.

So this is the kind of control we instituted in 11344 this three day convention at Riverside Plaza at that time. This daily working control list was turned over to Betty Gannett after each day after the daily sessions were over and next day we started with a new list with the same identical numbers and with the same procedure.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Now, were any persons admitted who were not invited?

The Witness: No persons were allowed to get in there without any authorization or delegates cards. Even the press was not allowed to get in there.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Who would keep them out? A. We had a person in charge of press relations. Her name was Marian Bachrach. She was in charge of keeping the press out.

Q. Were Party members stationed at the door? A. Yes, we had security guards, not only keeping those that are not invited to the convention out, but also not to allow any commotion there or walking around, to maintain the highest type of discipline in that particular convention.

Q. Who was in charge of security at the 1948 national convention? A. I was.

11345 Q. Who was in charge of security at the 1948 state convention? A. I was.

Q. Mr. Lautner, did you ever attend any National Committee meetings? A. Yes.

Q. During what period of time? A. From 1936 up to about 1941.

Q. You were not a member of the Committee? A. No.

Q. What would be the occasion for your attendance? A. There was a procedure in the Party twice a year to have plenary sessions of the National Committee, usually in the spring and in the fall. From 1936 on these plenary sessions of the National Committee, district organizers and other additional functionaries of the Communist Party who were not members of the National Committee but were key people in various organizations were invited to participate in the plenary sessions of the 11347 National Committee.

Q. What public notice, if any, was given of the sessions? A. No public notice whatever. The National Committee, when called together, went into session, and the first general notice about the National Committee was usually either on the last day but most of the time when the National Committee meeting was over. Then there was public notice of it in the Daily Worker, that the National Committee met and there was news about the work of the National Committee, resolutions, decisions, et cetera. There was to my knowledge never any advance notice of a National Committee Meeting.

Q. Were any security measures adopted at those meetings? A. The same security measures prevailed in National Committee plenary sessions as I described in relation to the 1948 National Convention. In the course of those years from 1936 on the person who was in charge of the security of National Committee meetings was J. Peters.

Q. Did they have a meeting of this type during the trial of the eleven leaders of the Party? A. During the trial of the eleven leaders there were National Board meetings. I was instructed from time to time while the trial was going on and there was a long week-end or there was a 11348 free day, if the National Board was to meet, I was instructed by Gene Dennis to secure a number of meeting places for such meetings.

Q. What was Gene Dennis' position in the Party at that time? A. Gene Dennis was the General Secretary of the Communist Party. He described the type of place he wants, the location he would like to have the meeting to be held, and this was usually on a Monday or Tuesday if the meeting is to take place the following week-end. So I solicited two or three or sometimes five places. I got these places for him around Thursday. Then he told me that he was dissatisfied with some of the places, some he didn't make comment. Then he said, "Well, we will check." He selected one place out of the five. I don't know which one where the meeting was to be held. On one occasion he made a sudden shift there from Long Island out to Westchester County. There was some security problem there, and he told me that this shouldn't happen any more. A place secured in Westchester County through the County Chairman wasn't secure enough. It was in a small community where there were a lot of party members living there. They knew right away when cars were pulling in that Communist Party leaders were meeting over there. I got scolded for not exercising vigilance enough and checking personally on that place.

When he selected the place where the meeting was to be held it was at his discretion. I know on 11349 early Saturday morning he gave me a note to give to Bob where the meeting would be.

Q. Who is Bob? A. Bob Thompson, who was state chairman of the Party.

Q. Let me go back and ask you, what was your position in the Party at that time? A. I was head of the 1350 State Review Commission and a member of the National Review Commission and in charge of security for the New York State organization of the Communist Party.

Q. Do you know why you were selected to do this particular type of work? A. I have no other reason to believe

than the fact that when I was brought into the state organization as a Review Commission secretary, the person who held that position prior to me was doing the same thing, and that was J. Peters.

Q. Did you attend any of these board meetings? A. No. I want to say that at one occasion I knew the place selected and I was observing whether any of the persons that went to this place, whether they were shadowed or tailed. That board meeting was held in New York on 22nd Street just about a stone's throw away from where I lived. I had an opportunity to observe that morning whether any of the leaders who came to the meeting were shadowed by the authorities.

Q. Did Dennis tell you why he wanted you to select a number of places? A. Yes. He said that he wanted to make his own choice. It was a security measure on his part. The final decision was to avoid going into a place that might be wired.

Q. How many were on the board? A. Twelve or thirteen.

Q. Do you know how they were notified of the meeting? A. I beg your pardon.

Q. Do you know how they were notified of the meeting? A. They were notified personally by Eugene Dennis.

Q. Speaking about the organization of the Party now, into what sections were professional and semi-professional people placed? A. In industrial sections that were organized under the leadership of the New York County organization.

Q. What do you mean by industrial sections? A. Industrial sections were composed of members who worked in the same industry and were integrated in a special section having plans and aims for working among those industrial workers and shops or offices where these people were occupied.

Q. You mentioned teachers a while ago in your testimony. Were they in a separate section?

The Witness: Yes. Teachers were organized up until 1948 in clubs, and these teachers clubs were distributed first among various counties and various sections 11352 in the counties. In the school year of 1948 and 1949 there was an effort to organize the teachers into a different type of organization, to break up these clubs and to eliminate these clubs and to organize them into a security structure where three teachers would be in one group and they would work in echelons, and the primary steps in this direction to integrate the teachers from the various clubs into this structure was abruptly halted at the end of the school year '48-'49. They went on their vacations. When they came together in 1949, September, this organization then proceeded until by the time I was expelled from the Communist Party 300-some-odd teachers were integrated into this new structure with a committee of three. That was a separate organization. With this structure there was a liaison established that would communicate with the Party leadership.

Q. Were they open and notorious members of the Party?

The Witness: Some of them were known as Party members. Most of them were active in local 555 of the Teachers Union. They were carrying out the trade union policy there, the Party trade union policy in the local union, which was known as the left-wing teachers trade union organization.

11353 By Mr. Paisley:

Q. To what extent were the teachers open and notorious members?

The Witness: Some of them were ex-teachers who were known to be Party members. Some of them became Party functionaries, like Isadore Bengun. He was known as a former school teacher and became a Party leader. There

was Dave Goldway, who was a school teacher, and he became head of the Jefferson School. And there were others. Some of them were teaching in the Jefferson School. They left the school system. Most of the teachers were active as trade unionists in their own organizations and in the parent teachers association and other types of activities that teachers would be active in.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Were there any other professional or semi-
11354 professional groups to your knowledge? A. Yes.

There were. I think I testified to the fact that there were civil service workers organized in a section. There were federal workers organized in a section. There were lawyers organized in a section. The person who was in charge of civil service workers was N. Rollins.

Q. Who was the section organizer for lawyers? A. For the lawyers the section organizer was Abe Unger. Abe Unger was known also as the Party attorney, with offices at 100 Fifth Avenue.

Q. Did you have any official contact with him? A. Oh, yes, as a Party attorney and also as a section organizer. He attended large county committee meetings as the Party representative of attorneys.

Q. Do you know how many members he had in his section? A. I wouldn't know. I don't know.

Mr. Abt: I object.

The Witness: I know some of them, but I don't know the names.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. These professional and semi-professional groups which you have mentioned—was the membership generally known?

11355 The Witness: Not in these professional sections. The reason for that was that—

The Witness: To give personal protection, personal security to these individuals because in the main their effectiveness in their respective professions would have been impaired if they were to be known Communists.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Do you know May Miller? A. Yes.

Q. Did you work with her? A. Yes, May Miller was the assistant organizational secretary of the New York State Organization of the Communist Party.

Q. Did you and she have anything to do with this teacher set-up? A. Yes. May Miller and myself were designated by the Party secretariat to carry out this reorganization and to integrate the school teachers in this special structure to safeguard their identity and their security as Party members.

Q. What was the purpose of this teacher section?

The Witness: Because there was an attack against left-wing teachers in New York. There were laws made in Albany, the Fineberg Law, and the Board of Higher Education was under pressure to ferret out Communist teachers. The Party felt it was necessary to give the utmost security to the teachers who were members of the Communist Party within the framework of the organizational structure of the Communist Party.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. What was the status of this teacher organization when you left the Party?

The Witness: The status of this teachers organization was that the reorganization was completed. Out of a possible 500 party members, teachers in the New York school system, a little over 300 were integrated into this new structure, and at the time I left the Party a top liaison maintained contact, a top committee of this new structure